DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 008 95 HE 006 865

AUTHOR Astin, Alexander W.; Bisconti, Ann S.
TITLE Protest Behavior and Response on the U.S. Campus. Volume I: An Overview.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-9-0364
PUB DATE Feb 71
GRANT OEG-0-9-180364-44-17(010)
NOTE 70p.; Tables 7 (one page) and 20 (one page) will reproduce poorly because of small print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Administrative Policy; Administrator Attitudes; *Higher Education; Institutional Role; Political Attitudes; *Schematic Studies; Student Behavior; *Student College Relationship; Student Participation

ABSTRACT

As part of a continuing examination of aspects of campus unrest, background, purpose and data information of the protest activity occurring during the academic year 1969-1970 was collected and used to analyze protest behavior and response. By recording all events in a single protest, as well as participants in each event, in sequential order, interrelationships between issues, participants, protest response, precipitation, and amplifying factors were examined. Some findings indicated racial protests resulted more than others because of nonresolution of previous protests; war-related protests were often precipitated by the arrival on campus of an industrial or governmental representative; racial protests made the greatest overall impact on the campus and war-related ones the least; black students led most racial protests, radical left students led most war-related protests, and unaffiliated students led most of those on issues of academic and student life; administrators were most responsive in black protests and least so in war-related ones; violence and civil action appear to be amplifying factors in protest; campus police presence tends to precede violence but off campus police presence tends to follow the first violent act; administration negative or nonresponse also preceded and is highly associated with violence; disruption appears to be associated more with persons than with events. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

BR 9-0364
PA 24

HE

ED114008

PROTEST BEHAVIOR AND RESPONSE ON THE U. S. CAMPUS

VOLUME I: AN OVERVIEW

Alexander W. Astin and Ann S. Bisconti

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report Submitted to the Office of Education
Grant OEG-0-9-180364-44 17(010)
February, 1971

HE 006865

Foreward

This study was originally undertaken as part of the continuing examination by the ACE Office of Research of all aspects of campus unrest. It was designed to examine the phenomenon in greater depth than previously attempted. The study developed into a fascinating one for us not only because of the subject matter and the findings, but also because of the original methodology. For this reason, we have decided to present the results of this research in two volumes. Volume I: An Overview deals with the background, purpose, and data collection. In addition, it contains both a description of protest activity during academic year 1969 - 1970 and an analysis of protest behavior and response. Volume II: Analytical Report will contain the findings of a new approach to multiple regression analysis. The method of analysis, based on a reading of only those events in a particular protest which occurred prior to the dependent variable, will be discussed along with the findings and implications.

Acknowledgements

We should like to express our gratitude to the many persons who contributed to the successful completion of this research project. Alan E. Bayer of the American Council on Education, who originated the project, provided many helpful suggestions on all phases of the research and contributed greatly to the development of a workable methodology. Helen S. Astin, Director of Research at University Research Corporation, was especially helpful in the development of data processing specifications. Shawne Lampert was responsible for the complicated task of computer programming. Organization of files, coding, mailing of letters to representatives and all clerical tasks were performed under the supervision of Barbara A. Blandford and Jeannie T. Royer. Finally, we should like to thank Winslow H. Hatch, Research Associate in Charge, Basic Studies Branch, Division of Higher Education Research, for his continued support.

This research was supported by the Office of Education Grant OEG-0-9-180364-44 17 (010).

Table of Contents

		Page
	Foreward	
	Acknowledgements	
I.	Background	1
II.	Part I: Survey of Campus Unrest, 1969-1970	5
III.	Part II: Sequence of Events in Protest	16
IV.	Volume I -- Summary	59
V.	Appendix I: Letter to Institutional Representatives	63

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Campus Protests in the United States During the 1969-1970 Academic Year	6
2.	Summary of Protests in 1969-1970 (Four-Year Institutions Only)	10
3.	Correlations Between Non-institutionally Directed Protests and Selected Institutional Characteristics	12
4.	Correlations Between Protests Against the Institutions and Selected Institutional Characteristics	14
5.	Sample Protests	18
6.	Validity Check	28
7.	Specific Issues in the Protests	30
8.	Precipitating Factors	32
9.	Effects of the Protest on Campus Activities in General	33
10.	Participants with Subject Role	34
11.	Protest Leadership	36
12.	Incitement to Protest by the Campus Newspaper	37
13.	Evaluation of the Objectivity of the Campus Newspapers in Reporting Events	38
14.	Incidence of Selected Types of Protest Events -- Percent of Protests with at Least One Event of Each Type	40
15.	Incidence of Selected Protest Behaviors	41
16.	Persons Involved in Protests with Violence	43
17.	Incidence of Selected Responses to Protest Behavior	44
18.	Apparent Unwillingness to Compromise	46
19.	Participation in Negotiations	47
20.	Changes on Primary and Secondary Issues	49

List of Tables (Continued)

Table		Page
21.	Protests Apparently Resolved with Issues Settled.....	51
22.	Highest Reported Participation of Students as Protesters.....	52
23.	Size of Student Participation in Relation to the First Occurrence of Violence, Police on Campus, and Arrests.....	53
24.	Variables Associated with Higher Number of Events.....	54
25.	Order of First Occurrence -- Violence and Other Events.....	56
26.	Order of First Occurrence -- Disruption and Other Events.....	57
27.	Order of First Occurrence -- Changes and Other Events.....	58

Background

Although much attention has been focused on campus unrest during the past years, surprisingly few efforts have been made to examine the interaction of protest themes, events, participant groups, and administrative response. Several campus observers have described in detail the rise of protest and the specific events and consequences, but this kind of an in-depth analysis had been confined primarily to a single institution until the completion in early 1970 of two research reports. The study described in this paper is their offspring.

The first study, reported by Bayer and Astin in the article "Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus, 1968-1969,"[1] utilized a questionnaire which was mailed to campus representatives and which was designed to gain facts about protest incidence, tactics, and issues, as well as disciplinary measures and changes. The response from 382 institutions provided new insights regarding the relationship of the university environment (institutional and personal) to protest incidents and outcomes. For example, a relationship was found between an impersonal environment and protest over Vietnam and racial policies, but this relationship did not exist when the issues involved student life. Other findings indicated that administrators handle protests concerning racial policy most severely. On the other hand, racial protests were most successful in goal-achievement when employing disruptive and violent tactics.

---

[1]Alan E. Bayer and Alexander W. Astin, "Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus, 1968-69," Educational Record, Fall 1969, pp. 337-50. The study was also reported in: Alexander W. Astin, "Campus Disruption, 1968-69: An Analysis of Causal Factors," Psychology and the Problems of Society, ed. Frances F. Korten, Stuart W. Cook, and John I. Lacey (Washington: American Psychological Association, 1970), pp. 377-87.

The other parent study was conducted by Helen S. Astin and her staff at the Bureau of Social Science Research.[2] It involved the analysis of themes and events of protest utilizing carefully prepared documentations of 22 separate protests. These documentations were compiled following specific guidelines and relying for source material on administrative reports, personal observation, and newspaper clippings. As it turned out, the most useful source was found to be the campus newspaper. Daily newspapers and wire services, of course, do not report every incident of unrest, and in the case of questionnaires sent to college officials, each respondent is being asked, in essence, to remember every detail of every protest incident that occurred during the year. Student newspapers, on the other hand, carry reports of all protest incidents of any significance that occur on the campus, and generally they cover the events in detail.

The patterns which emerged from the analysis of these documentations supplement the Bayer, Astin findings. For example, black demands and war-related issues arose most often in institutions attended by students from high socioeconomic backgrounds, whereas protests over student power occurred in the less selective of the 22 institutions. Large student support and violence tended to accompany racial protests.

One new focus of this study was the relationship of themes and responses. The responses to sit-ins, for example, varied from none at all to negotiations, police intervention, or threats (which were generally heeded by the protesters). Disciplinary action was frequently followed by more protest behavior.

In the fall of 1969, the Office of Research of the American Council on Education took subscriptions to campus newspapers of 450 institutions of higher education, in order to monitor U.S. campus activities throughout the

---

[2]Helen S. Astin, Themes and Events of Campus Unrest in Twenty-two Colleges and Universities. BSSR Research Report, 1969.

academic year. One could well imagine hundreds of newspapers piled from floor to ceiling in a back room of a research office. On the contrary, they were efficiently organized on shelves and in file cabinets, where they were an excellent source of data waiting to be examined. Thus, three elements combined for the inevitability of the present study: The documentation study demonstrated the usefulness of newspapers for the examination of themes and responses, a series of questions had been raised which demonstrated a need for the careful analysis of sequences of events in protest, and the data lay on the shelves of ACE.

By early 1970, a two-part study plan was developed. Part One, a "survey" of incidents of unrest occurring across the nation during the 1969-70 academic year, is based on the entire file of 223 complete sets of newspapers. The purpose of this part of the study was, by applying weights, to obtain estimates for the entire population regarding issues and outcomes in campus unrest. In addition, this "survey" was intended to serve as a basis for the selection of a smaller sample of protests to be examined in detail in Part Two of the study. The detailed analysis of this subsample, through an elaborate coding scheme, was designed to explain sequences of events in order to make some judgments regarding cause and effect in protest.

The research plan was discussed at a February 3 meeting of the Advisory Committee for Campus Unrest and Change.[3] We are grateful to these advisors for their suggestions regarding the analysis. One or two had serious doubts about the validity of using college newspapers as a research source; if college newspapers are as pro-protest as they are reputed to be, what would the data represent? We believed, on the other hand, that newspaper bias would not, in most cases, affect the reporting of events as

---

[3]Advisory Committee members present were: Wayne Holtzman (Chairman), Amitai Etzioni, Reverend Andrew Greeley, Seymour Halleck, Joseph Kauffman, Kenneth Keniston, David Riesman, Eli A. Rubenstein, M. Brewster Smith.

they occurred. For example, a sit-in may be covered on page one or page twenty-two, it may be called beautiful or subversive, but in any case it remains a sit-in. However, we felt strongly that a validity check had to be performed. Since it was felt that campus newspaper editors might be biased against administrators, why not submit the data for critical evaluation to the administrators themselves? The results of this validity check are discussed on page 25.

Part I: Survey of Campus Unrest, 1969-70

All newspapers in the ACE files were organized by a team of researchers which included Joan Trexler, Christine Kelly, Donna Mackey, and Altaf Ahmed. They valiantly read each paper from first to last page and took notes on all protest incidents. These notes were used in the count of issues and outcomes in protest. Because some of the newspaper sets were incomplete, the final sample consisted of 223 institutions.

In order to obtain estimates for the entire population of 2,429 institutions, the data from these 223 colleges were differentially weighted according to the ACE institutional stratification design (Creager, 1968). Since the sample of institutions that participated in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program has been selected so as to over-represent the larger and the more selective institutions (Astin, Panos, and Creager, 1967), newspaper data from the two-year colleges and from the smaller and relatively unselective four-year colleges received the largest weights in generating the popluation estimates.

The weighted and unweighted results of the newspaper search are shown in Table 1. Our weighted estimates indicate that there were more than 9,000 separate protest incidents[4] on American campuses during the past academic year. Although this is an average of more than three protest incidents per institution, only two-thirds of the institutions actually experienced one or more incidents. This means that while the typical institution experienced an average of five protest incidents, one-third of all institutions were virtually untouched by campus unrest during 1969-70.

---

[4] In this count, distinctly new phases of possibly ongoing protests were treated as separate "incidents". In contrast, Part Two of the study, because of the in-depth analysis, deals with the whole protest as unit of analysis.

Table 1

Campus Protests in the United States
During the 1969-1970 Academic Year

Type of Incident	Unweighted Sample Data (N = 223 Institutions)		Weighted Population Estimates (N = 2429 Institutions)	
	Total Number of Incidents	Percentage of Institutions Experiencing One or More Incidents	Total Number of Incidents	Percentage of Institutions Experiencing One or More Incidents
All Protests	1493	82.5	9408	66.9
Protests Directed Against the Institution: (total)	(612)	(54.7)	(3348)	(34.1)
War-related	160	26.9	579	10.6
Racial issues	162	30.0	1031	15.7
Facilities and student life	228	41.3	1359	25.6
Student power in decision-making	24	8.1	171	5.7
Faculty and staff	5	2.2	20	.1
Community relations	12	4.0	64	2.4
Other	21	8.1	124	3.9
Protests Not Directed Against the Institution: (total)	(881)	(81.2)	(6060)	(65.3)
Earth Day	102	44.4	945	38.7
October Moratorium	91	40.4	784	32.2
November Moratorium	84	37.7	540	22.2
December Moratorium	21	9.4	127	5.2
Later Moratoria	129	31.8	729	19.0
Other war-related	188	41.7	1027	25.0
Cambodia invasion	58	22.4	419	16.1
Kent State killings	75	28.3	639	23.7
Jackson State killings	10	4.0	53	2.1
Augusta, Georgia killings	5	2.2	28	1.2
Other	118	25.1	769	15.1
Specific Outcomes of Protests				
One or more arrested	124	18.4	731	11.9
Damage to property	50	12.1	410	7.4
Physical violence	45	9.4	230	3.4

The most frequent type of protest incident during the past year involved issues not directly related to the institution. These included the various Moratorium protests in the Fall and Winter, the observance of "Earth Day," and the Spring demonstrations against the Cambodian invasion and the killings at Kent State and Jackson State colleges. Earth day involved the largest number of participants -- 44 percent of all institutions. This finding is consistent with recent ACE survey data on college students (Staff of the Office of Research, 1970), which indicate that environmental pollution is perhaps the students' greatest single concern.

It will be recalled that the idea behind the Moratorium observances was that there would be one each month, with the first taking one day, the second taking two, the third three, and so on until the American military forces were completely removed from Viet Nam. About one-third of the institutions experienced some protest in observance of the October Moratorium, a slightly smaller number experienced protests during the November Moratorium, whereas the December Moratorium was observed at only a handful of institutions.

Since the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State and Jackson State killings occurred closely together in time, several institutions simultaneously experienced protests over two or even all three events. Wherever appropriate, these were counted as separate protests. In cases where more than one event was the subject of a single protest, the event which was first raised was considered as the primary issue. It is of interest to note that the Kent State killings resulted in somewhat more protests (24 percent) than did the Cambodian invasion (16 percent), even though the Cambodian invasion occurred first. Apparently, the Kent State killings generated somewhat more widespread student concern.

Some of the most interesting forms of outwardly-directed protest this past year are included in the "other" category: These have included such things

as support for the Chicago 7 (actually a protest of the results of the trial), anti-pollution protests, support for a breakfast program and day care center for the children of the non-academic employees of the community, support for the California grape boycott, blood drives for Viet Nam casualties, support of the Biafrans, anti-Agnew protests, rent strikes against the off-campus landlords, support for a speaker who had been banned from the university because of his too liberal views, and a demonstration by a "No-Sex-Before-Marriage Club" organized to promote a "stronger youth."

In spite of the emphasis on protest directed outside of the institution, more than one-third of all institutions still experienced at least one protest directed against the institution itself. Since many of these protests occurred during the first semester, the notion that 1969 was a "relatively quiet Fall" does not seem to be supported by the facts. The most frequent type of protest against an institution involved issues other than Viet Nam or black demands. Specifically, these included such issues as the hiring or firing of professors, tuition increases, rent hikes, demands for representation on the board of trustees, curricular requirements, and related issues. About one in seven of the institutions experienced protests involving black demands (requests for black studies programs, separate dormitory facilities for blacks, special admissions policies for blacks, and related issues). One-tenth of the institutions experienced protests that were related to the War in Indochina (ROTC, military recruiting, government-sponsored research, etc.).

When we examine the more extreme manifestations of campus unrest -- incidents that involved physical violence, damage to property, or arrests -- the extent of institutional participation drops off considerably. Twelve percent of all institutions had protests that resulted in arrests. An even smaller number --

seven percent -- had protests that involved destruction of property, and less than four percent had protests that involved physical violence. Still, it must be remembered that our estimate of 3.4 percent, when translated into actual numbers of institutions, means that more than 80 American colleges and universities experienced physical violence in connection with one or more protest incidents during 1969-70.

As it turns out, the two-year institutions in our sample had relatively few protests during 1969-70. However, since our subsample of two-year institutions was relatively small (only 27 in all), we recomputed the weighted and unweighted tabulations using only the data from the 196 four-year institutions. These new tabulations, which are shown in Table 2, give a somewhat different picture of campus unrest, since the base rates for most types of protests are considerably higher. Among those four-year institutions experiencing some protest (80 percent of the total), the average number of incidents per institution is seven. Of the various specific incidents, protests over the Viet Nam war and over racial issues show the largest relative rates of increase (more than 50 percent each) when the two-year colleges are omitted.

Institutional Correlates

What kinds of institutions were most likely to experience protests during 1969-70? Were different types of protests associated with different types of institutions? In order to obtain preliminary answers to these questions, we computed product-moment correlations between each type of protest and 15 selected institutional characteristics such as size, selectivity, and type of control. Several of these characteristics had been shown in earlier

Table 2

Summary of Protests in 1969-70
(Four-Year Institutions Only)

Type of Incident	Unweighted Sample Data (N = 196 Institutions)		Weighted Population Estimates (N = 1578 Institutions)	
	Total Number of Incidents	Percentage of Institutions Experiencing One or More Incidents	Total Number of Incidents	Percentage of Institutions Experiencing One or More Incidents
All Protests	1456	87.8	8169	80.2
Protests Directed Against the Institution: (total)	(608)	(60.7)	(3188)	(45.4)
War-related	160	30.6	579	16.3
Racial Issues	162	33.7	1031	24.2
Facilities and student life	226	45.9	1261	33.3
Student power in decision-making	22	8.2	109	4.9
Faculty and staff	5	2.6	20	1.3
Community relations	12	4.6	64	3.7
Other	21	9.2	124	6.0
Protests Not Directed Against the Institution: (total)	(848)	(86.2)	(4981)	(78.0)
Earth Day	94	46.4	698	43.9
October Moratorium	84	42.3	560	35.4
November Moratorium	80	40.8	417	26.4
December Moratorium	21	10.7	127	8.0
Later Moratoria	128	35.7	680	26.1
Other war-related	185	46.4	962	35.2
Cambodia invasion	57	25.0	380	22.3
Kent State killings	72	30.6	538	30.1
Jackson State killings	10	4.6	53	3.2
Augusta, Georgia killings	5	2.6	28	1.8
Other	112	26.5	538	14.8
Specific Outcomes of Protests				
One or more arrested	120	19.9	535	12.2
Damage to property	48	13.3	312	8.3
Physical violence	45	10.7	230	5.3

studies (Astin and Bayer, 1971; Bayer and Astin, 1970; Hodgkinson, 1970; Peterson, 1967) to be related to the occurrence of campus protests. We also carried out separate stepwise multiple regression analyses, in which the college characteristics served as independent variables and each of the different types of protests were used as dependent variables.

Results of these analyses for noninstitutionally-directed protests are shown in Table 3. The institutional characteristics are listed approximately in their order of importance, and only the nine characteristics that entered one or more of the regression analyses are shown. The multiple correlation coefficients (last row of Table 3) indicate that the November Moratorium and "other" war-related protests are most closely related to institutional characteristics, whereas the October Moratorium and the Jackson State protests are least related to these characteristics. The patterns of correlations involving enrollments and universities are very similar, as are the patterns involving percent Ph.D.s on the faculty and selectivity. It is of interest to note that these two sets of variables reflect the two principal attributes of institutional prestige or status: size and academic "quality" (see Astin, 1970). In other words, noninstitutionally-directed protests -- especially those involving war-related issues -- were most likely to occur in institutions of high prestige.

The patterns of institutional correlates with protests over the Kent State and Jackson State killings provide an interesting picture of student and institutional identification. Protests over the killings at Kent State (which is a public institution) were most likely to occur in public institutions, whereas protests over the killings at Jackson State (which is a predominantly Black college) were most likely to occur in predominantly Black colleges.

Table 3

Correlations Between Non-institutionally Directed Protests and Selected Institutional Characteristics (N = 196 Four-year Institutions)

Institutional Characteristic	Protest Issue						
	Earth Day	Oct. Mora-torium	Nov. Mora-torium	Kent State	Jackson State	Cambo-dia	War-Related (other)
University	.20	.04	.36	.21	.13	.16	.46*
Enrollment size	.23	.14	.40*	.19	.14*	.19	.44*
% Ph.D.s on faculty	.16*	.28*	.36*	.01	.12	.17	.29
Selectivity	.05	.22	.28	-.08	.04	.16*	.23*
Public (vs. private)	.24*	-.01	.17	.29*	.10	.30*	.24
Private-nonsectarian	-.04	.15	.13*	-.17	.03	-.06	.00
Predominantly black	-.12	-.02	-.10	-.08	.17*	-.07	-.03
Located in Southeast	.17*	-.09	-.10	.03	-.04	-.09	-.20*
Located in West or Southwest	.05	-.04	.03	.09	.14	.21*	.10
(Multiple R)	(.32)	(.28)	(.50)	(.34)	(.23)	(.44)	(.52)

*Entered the stepwise multiple regression analysis and contributed significantly ($p < .05$) in the final solution.

NOTE: $r_{.05} = .14$; $r_{.01} = .19$.

Demonstrations in observance of Earth Day were most likely to occur in large, public institutions of relative high academic quality. However, these demonstrations were also more likely to occur at institutions located in the Southeastern states -- a somewhat remarkable finding in view of the fact that a Southeastern location tends to be negatively related to almost every other type of protest. Apparently, the issues involved in the Earth Day observance have a qualitatively different appeal to students in Southern institutions.

Even the October and November moratoria show somewhat different patterns of institutional correlates. Whereas the October observance was most closely related to the measures of academic quality, the November observance was related more to the two measures of size.

Table 4 shows the institutional correlates of protests directed against the institution. (As in Table 3, we have shown only those institutional variables that entered at least one of the four multiple regression analyses.) Two types of institutionally directed protest -- those against the war and those concerned with facilities and student life -- are more closely related to institutional characteristics than are any of the noninstitutionally directed protests. The pattern of institutional correlates for all four types of inwardly-directed protests, however, are very similar to the patterns associated with outwardly-directed protests: substantial positive relations with measures of institutional size and quality. Size seems to be of more importance than quality in the case of protests concerning facilities and student life and war-related protests, whereas size and quality are of about equal importance in the case of protests on racial issues.

The finding that almost all types of protests are most likely to occur in the larger and the more selective institutions confirms the findings of

Table 4

Correlations Between Protests Against the Institutions and Selected Institutional Characteristics (N = 196 Four-year Institutions)

Institutional Characteristic	Protest Issue			
	War-Related	Racial	Facilities and Student Life	Student Power
University	.49*	.34	.57*	.27*
Enrollment size	.49*	.39*	.54*	.19
% Ph.D.s on faculty	.29	.35*	.32*	.12
Selectivity	.29*	.22	.17	.08
Located in Midwest	.05*	-.02	-.09	-.03
(Multiple R)	(.58)	(.45)	(.60)	(.27)

*Entered the stepwise multiple regression analysis and contributed significantly ($r < .05$) in the final solution.

NOTE: $r_{.05} = .14$; $r_{.01} = .19$.

several earlier studies (Bayer and Astin, 1969; Peterson, 1968). There are at least two reasons why such institutions tend to be protest-prone. In the first place, they are more likely than the less visible institutions to attract protest-prone students (Astin, 1968; Astin and Bayer, 1971). Thus, the association between protests and measures of institutional quality may reflect more the differential recruitment practices of institutions rather than any institutional effect of quality per se. Second, the size of an institution and its emphasis on graduate work seems to be causally related to the emergence of protests, even after adjustments are made for differences in characteristics of the students who enroll (Astin and Bayer, 1971).

There are at least two possible explanations for the apparent causal association between institutional size and student protest activity. One interpretation, which might be labeled the "critical mass" hypothesis, states that as the size of the enrollment increases, the probability also increases that there will be sufficient numbers of protest-prone students to make a "critical mass" which can generate a protest. An alternative explanation is based on the fact that the environments of larger institutions (the universities in particular) are typically characterized by relatively little administrative concern for the individual student and a low rate of personal interaction between faculty and students (Astin, 1968). The resulting feelings of student alienation and depersonalization are thus manifest in protest behavior. Currently in progress at ACE are several studies in which we are attempting to test these two hypotheses empirically.

Part II: Sequence of Events in Protest

Based on the tally of protests occurring between September 1969 and February 1970, a subsample of 103 separate protests was selected for detailed analysis. Aside from determining the incidence of certain issues, tactics, leadership groups, disciplinary measures, and changes, we sought answers to the following questions.

What effects do issues, tactics and leadership have on general student support? . . . and on administrative response?

What tactics are used for different issues, in different situations, by different leaders?

What are the leadership groups in different types of institutions, for different types of protest?

What are the effects of leadership, tactics, and general student support on the achievement of primary and secondary goals?

What happens when leadership is mixed?

How does the administrative response affect the protest?

What types of changes are made in different situations?

We planned to devote special attention to the identification of factors which precipitate violence and to the study of the effects of violence on subsequent events and responses. We also hoped to identify patterns related to the use of police.

Sample Selection

During the first months of the 1969-70 school year, there were basically two types of protest: those directed against the institution and those involving campus participants but directed outside the institution, such as Moratorium marches. Because of our interest in studying the interaction of different

campus groups, especially protesters and administrators, we decided to examine only the protests which were actually directed against some aspect of the institution or which advocated a change which an administrative figure could conceivably bring about. For example, a university administrator could not be expected to end the war in Vietnam. However, if the goals were to obtain campus facilities for Moratorium marchers, the protest would meet the criteria of our sample.

Table 5 presents the final subsample. It should be noted that all counts in this table are for September through February and that the unit represented is "protest" rather than "protest incident" (the unit of analysis in Part One).

One important question is: How do you define "a protest" and what constitutes the beginning and the end of a particular protest? For this study we developed the following working definition of a protest:

> Events apparently related to demands or requests for changes which are made known to authorities at the institution outside of the traditional legislative apparatus.

Relationship of events to a single protest was determined on the basis of the following factors, usually in combination: issues, participants, and simultaneous presentation of demands. Because the data recording had to be performed during a limited time period, papers were examined only for September 1969 through March 1970. As a result, some decisions regarding beginning and end of particular protests may have been arbitrary (i.e., if they were hang-overs from the previous academic year or if, by the cut-off date, they were unresolved). However, we made certain that, if a protest had not reached the resolution stage but was clearly ongoing, the data recording continued even beyond the cut-off date.

Table 5

Sample Protests

	ACE Newspaper Files	Subsample
# institutions experiencing protest (directed against the institution)	84	67
Total # protests (directed against the institution)	155	103
First primary issue:		
Industrial/military	44	37
Black demands	36	25
Other (tuition, facilities, student power, etc.)	66	41

Recording of Data

Because the coding scheme and data recording procedures are complex, they are described in detail on the following pages. Each protest was recorded on a form consisting of four parts: (a) sequence of events, (b) issues and changes, (c) additional information, and (d) the newspaper. When more than one protest was examined per institution, each protest required a separate form.

A. Sequence of Events - A coding scheme including 64 different events was developed for this part of the form. For purposes of comparability, most of the events in the Bayer-Astin study were included. Six of these events are categorized as nondisruptive expression of dissent.

Demands or grievances presented to authority
Petition
Campus picketing, march, rally, teach-in
Statement pro-protest (by nonprotesters)
Boycott of facilities-cafeteria etc.
Student government statement pro-protest

The coding scheme includes ten types of disruptive acts.

Sit-in, building or section of building occupied
Entrance to building or section of building barred or closed
Interruption of school function (recruiting)
General campus strike or boycott of classes
Official (s) held captive
Disruption (unspecified)
Property disruption without destruction (books thrown, tables overturned etc.)
Interruption of school function (classes, speech, meeting)
Illegal intervisitation

While the above events could, in most cases, be considered protest "tactics" it should be stressed that most of the following violent acts are to be thought of as "incidents".

Violence (unspecified)
Burning of building, bomb
Destruction of records, files, papers
Breaking or wrecking of building or furnishings
One or more persons injured
Fight involving demonstrators, objects thrown

Six types of responses reflect an attempt to resolve protest through communications.

Negotiations, discussions with protesters
Study group or committee formed to study demands, administration discusses demands with trustees, faculty discussions
Administration explains position at meeting, using media-clarification
Recommendations for compromise, changes (not necessarily pro-protest)
Poll to assess opinion on protest issue, referendum

The following disciplinary measures are all institutional sanctions.

Institutional punitive or judiciary action (unspecified)
Case before institution's judiciary body, appellate hearing
Student(s) suspended, put on probation
Student(s) expelled
Financial aid withdrawn
Reprimands only
Recommendation for expulsion/probation/suspension
Privilege withdrawn, suspension from activity

The following civil actions may also be initiated by the institution but are implemented beyond its jurisdiction.

Civil action (unspecified) - Civil judicial proceedings
National guard called in
Off-campus police called in
Temporary restraining order or injunction obtained
Temporary restraining order or injunction served
One or more protesters arrested, or warrant for arrest
One or more protesters indicted or convicted

An assortment of rather diverse acts to slow down, control, or counteract protests or to show support for the administration are accounted for in the coding scheme.

Statement pro administration
Protesters decide to stop protest
Attempts at order
Rally etc. vs. protest
Physical counteraction
Petition vs. protest

Changes, permanent or temporary, are categorized as follows. Another section of the form is devoted to specifics on this subject.

Change on a primary issue - complete
Change on a primary issue - partial
Change on a secondary issue - complete
Change on a secondary issue - partial

A. Sequence of Events

#	Date Reported	Event	Offer Plan or Threat	Code For Event	Subject	Known	# Students Involved as Subject	Object
87								

Change made not related to protest issue
Temporary change - event called off
Punishment reduced - reversed (as result of demands)

The last items reflect negative or nonresponse.

Decision against changes
Deadline for meeting demands past
Refusal to discuss
Employee fired
Staff member fired > decision not to reconsider

The form was designed for recording in sequential order all occurrences of codable events (see page 21). Each line horizontally includes the number of event, the date the event was reported, the specific event (and if it was an actual occurrence as opposed to an offer, plan, or threat). Also included are the coded subject(s) (i.e., "who did it"), and object(s) (i.e., "to whom"). The following groups of participants may have been coded as subject or object depending on their role in the particular event.

Radical left (SDS)
Black students
Antiprotesters (YAF)
Students (general)
Police, security officers
Administration
Faculty
Trustees, alumni, parents
Off-campus participants
None or unknown

Space was also provided next to each event for recording the number of students involved whenever students initiated the event. No restriction was placed on the number of events which could be coded for a single protest. The shortest protest consisted of a single event, whereas the longest consisted of 62.

B. Issues and Changes - This section of the form provided space for recording specific information about the issues which arose in each protest and about the extent of any resulting change. The issues, like the events, were organized in a coding scheme which, in many respects, resembles that used by Bayer and Astin. For the analysis, the issues have been grouped

under three major categories: minority group interests, other aspects of academic life, and university policy on war-related and social issues.

The following issues relate to racial policy or attitudes and range from aspects of campus life to institutional policy regarding off-campus blacks.

Black studies or special programs
Special admissions, more black students
More blacks in faculty, administration, counselors
Official administration position against racism - general administrative racism
Facilities and activities for blacks - separate dorms, cultural center, black homecoming
Conditions of minority employees
More minority employees - jobs for black students
Greater black role in recruiting, more funds for recruiting
Use of facilities by town's blacks

The following issues include aspects of academic life without racial themes.

Student involvement in decision making (unspec.)
Student participation in advisory committees, long-range planning
Student voice in policy making re student life, administration of student conduct regulations tuition increases, Bill of Rights
Student voice in policy making re administration (i.e., search for administrators, administrative decisions)
Student voice in selection of faculty, evaluating of teachers
Student voice in curriculum revision or planning
Student participation in activities of trustees
Student voice in selection of speakers, free speech
Committee, ombudsman to handle grievances in future
Greater administrative use of media to communicate
Better communications - unspecified
Parietal rules liberalized, intervisitation
Facilities improved (i.e., cafeteria modernized, new recreation center promised)
No undercover narcs, drug enforcement policy
No information to draft board
Judiciary process of punitive action
Tuition - other fees
Police on campus, police action
Student employee conditions
Academic requirements, grades, honor system, gym requirements, curriculum
More scholarships in general

Issues relating to external affairs center on the war, the defense industry, the community and the environment.

Official position against Vietnam involvement, no classes during Moratorium, lower flag
ROTC terminated
ROTC altered or made elective
ROTC maintained
Versus campus war-related research, defense computer
Versus on-campus government or military recruiting
Versus on-campus industrial recruiting
Versus police training
Versus expansion in the community
Pro aid to community, improve rental units
University as environmental offender, versus reactor
Versus recruiting by or patronizing of environmental offenders
Labor problems (not specified pro blacks or students)

The coding format for issues is similar to that used for events, as it allows separate treatment of each issue in contiguity with other factors (see page 25). These factors include importance of the issue (primary versus secondary), time of introduction (at the beginning versus during the course of the protest), and changes made (complete, partial, or none as of March 1st, the cut-off date).

The total coding scheme provided two sets of data on changes. First, changes were treated as events and coded in sequence with other occurrences, and, second, they were recorded in relation to specific issues. As a result, we may examine the effect of a variety of variables in this important protest outcome.

C. Additional Information - In this part of the form we hoped to identify a variety of items regarding the protest as a whole, including precipitating factors, effects of the protest on campus activities in general, communications efforts, leadership groups, and permanence of settlement. Because scoring these items was highly evaluative, a reliability check was performed, resulting in the elimination or revision of some variables. Ten of the final 103 protests were coded independently by two researchers, and then results were compared.

Whenever less evaluation was involved, consensus was greatest. Agreement was at least 90 percent on leadership and permanence of settlement.

NAME OF INSTITUTION_____I.D.#_____PROTEST #_____

Issues and Changes

Issue	Code For Issue	Primary versus Secondary	Changes as of March 1st	Complete versus Partial

However, the distinction between "black student association" and "black students (general)" has been dropped. Agreement on precipitating factors was also at least 90 percent except for the factor "non-resolution of a previous protest," an additional influence in two protests which was not noted by the coder performing the check.

Consensus was most difficult to achieve when the evaluation involved the coder's personal frame of reference. The two disagreements about the effects of the protest on campus activities in general arose from different views of what constitutes "campus activities in general." (From the reading of newspapers, one could not hope, in any case, to derive more than a sketchy impression of the impact of a protest on campus life.) An attempt to score communications efforts on a scale was unsuccessful. By collapsing categories, however, we may legitimately maintain the following items: "unwilling to compromise" and "participated in negotiations."

D. The Newspaper - The last part of the form was devoted to an evaluation of the data source: the newspaper. We thought it important to make a distinction between editorial position and reporting bias, and therefore, editorials were not read until after the coder had evaluated the reporting. If the newspaper's position regarding issues, tactics, and participants could not be guessed without reading the editorials, the reporting was rated unbiased. Editorials were then read, and any actual editorial position on these three aspects of the protest was noted. The role of the newspaper was also assessed in terms of active incitement to protest and any references to editorial staff participation in the protest. The reliability check supported the inclusion of all of these items in the analysis, with the exception of "editorial position." The influence of personal frame of reference in scoring this kind of question is demonstrated by the 16 differences out of a possible 70.

Validation

Our major concern about the validity of the research concept arose from expectations of newspaper bias in reporting. We, therefore, mailed xeroxed copies of Part A (Sequence of Events) of the completed forms to administrative representatives at all institutions in the sample.[5] We asked these administrators to look over the written descriptions of the events for accuracy and sequential order.

About two-thirds of the administrators took the time to examine the written descriptions of sequence of events, and we are very grateful for their effort. As the following table shows, only 5 of the administrators sent back the forms with corrections which would affect the coding. (Some additional corrections of written descriptions would not change the coded sequence.)

Although the corrections were few, five should be noted. Two "sit-ins" would have been eliminated while another would have been placed in sequence before presentation of demands, discussions, and a petition. An "injunction" would have been changed to "threat of injunction." Finally, one administrator pointed out that we had somehow missed recording the burning of a building. In addition to the corrections, two administrators doubted the existence of a causal relationship between certain events and the rest of the protest. However, since the events relate to the same issue, we felt that they should be included.

Findings

Issues

In order to determine certain relationships in the protest process, it is first necessary to describe briefly the protests with which we are

---

[5] Contacts with representatives at these institutions had previously been made in order to implement the ACE Cooperative Institutional Research Program.

Table 6

Validity Check

	Institutions	Protests
Total in sample	67	103
Total returns	43	65
Corrections (affecting coding)	5	5
Doubt about relationship of some events to the protest	2	2

dealing. These protests, like those in the "survey," can be classified by theme under three broad headings: racial policies, academic and student life, and the institution's war-related and social involvement. The proportion of protests in each category closely approximates that of the survey. These categorizations are based on the first primary issue to arise in a particular protest. Some protests, of course, had several primary and several secondary issues. In terms of broad classification, the number of student and academic life protests exceeds both war-related and racial ones.

The specific issues are presented in Table 7. Facilities and student life and student power in decision-making comprise a large proportion of both primary and secondary issues categorized as "academic and student life." Student voice in policy making regarding student life, regulations, and tuition was a primary concern. The judiciary process or punitive action emerged frequently in these protests as either a primary or secondary issue, as did facilities, tuition, parietal rules and general student power. Some academic and student life protests also centered on the issue of staff members. As a primary issue, pro staff protests were as frequent as anti-staff protests, but animosities against staff also developed into a secondary issue during the course of some protests.

When the central theme of a protest was racial policies, the actual number of primary issues tended to be greater than for other types of protests, as black students generally enumerated a series of equal priority demands. These demands usually included facilities and activities, staff, black studies, admissions, and minority employees. Also involved was the general, intangible, issue of "racism." On the other hand, protests on war-related and other social issues usually developed from a central overriding issue such as on-campus recruiting (government or industrial), ROTC, and occasionally the institution's relation to community or environmental

Table 7

Specific Issues in the Protests

	Total Issues #	Primary Issues #	Secondary Issues #
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO FACILITIES AND STUDENT LIFE	47	32	15
Specific issue:			
Judiciary process or punitive action	14	7	7
Facilities improved	12	6	6
Tuition and other fees	8	6	2
Parietal rules, intervisitation	6	6	--
Academic requirements, curriculum, grading	5	4	1
Police on campus	3	1	2
Working conditions (students)	2	2	--
Drug policy	1	1	--
Draft information	1	--	1
Scholarships (general)	1	--	1
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO STUDENT POWER IN DECISION-MAKING	41	29	12
Specific issue:			
Student voice in policy-making regarding student life, regulations, tuition	18	14	4
Student involvement in decision-making (general)	13	11	2
Student involvement in activities of trustees	5	4	1
Student involvement in long-range planning, advisory committees	4	3	1
Student involvement in selection and evaluation of faculty	4	4	--
Student-administration communications	3	--	3
Student involvement in administrative policy-making	2	2	--
Student involvement in curriculum planning	2	2	--
Student involvement in selection of speakers	2	1	1
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO RACIAL POLICIES	40	32	8
Specific issue:			
Facilities, activities for black students	14	11	3
More black staff	13	12	1
Official position on racism, racism (general)	12	8	4
Black studies, programs	11	10	1
More black students, special admissions	8	8	--
Conditions of minority employees	6	6	--
Minority employees, jobs	4	4	--
Black role in recruiting	2	2	--
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO THE INSTITUTION'S WAR (DEFENSE)-RELATED INVOLVEMENT	40	34	6
Specific issue:			
On-campus government-military recruiting	15	12	3
ROTC terminated	11	10	1
On-campus industrial recruiting	6	6	--
Official position or action regarding Vietnam, Moratorium	5	2	3
War-related research, machinery	3	3	--
ROTC altered	1	1	--
Police training	1	1	--
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO FACULTY (STAFF)	15	10	5
Specific issue:			
Versus staff member	9	5	4
Pro staff member	5	5	--
Pro staff cut-backs	1	--	1
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO THE INSTITUTION'S INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COMMUNITY, THE ENVIRONMENT	5	5	--
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO WORKER/EMPLOYEE RELATIONS	2	1	1

problems.

Precipitating Factors

The background of the protests varies according to broad theme classification, as seen in Table 8. The most common precipitating factor was dissatisfaction with university policy, followed by dissatisfaction with a specific decision or action. In addition, racial protests resulted more than others from non-resolution of previous protests and dissatisfaction with facilities and services. Black students had, in many cases, been trying for some time to press for a series of policy changes, and the specific protests examined here were like episodes in a continuous effort. War-related and other social issues were precipitated in over half of the cases by the arrival on campus of an industrial or military representative (frequently a recruiter). Many of these protests were haphazard demonstrations of opposition, although some were broad-based and organized. Academic and student life protests were unlike the others in that almost all were distinctly new. In these cases, a specific action or decision was a frequent catalyst along with discontent with administrative policy.

Effects on Campus

Relatively few of the protests were of such dimensions as to significantly affect campus activities in general (see Table 9). That is, during the course of the protests, life on campus continued; classes were not cancelled, and the newspaper reported business as usual (sports and social events, visiting lecturers, etc.). However, racial protests tended to make the greatest overall impact and war-related ones the least.

The Actors

As each event in a protest was recorded, the actors were coded as subject or object on the basis of "who did what to whom." In Table 10, we see the extent to which each of nine "actor" groups played a "subject"

Table 8

Precipitating Factors

	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic - Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related-Other Social Issues (N = 37) %
Dissatisfaction with university policy	92	61	89
Dissatisfaction with a specific decision or action	24	66	22
Dissatisfaction with facilities or services	40	27	--
Arrival of an industrial-military representative	--	--	54
Non-resolution of a previous protest	44	7	22
Confrontation tactics	--	--	8
Emotional - personal factors	4	7	--
Other	--	--	--

Table 9

Effects of the Protest on Campus Activities in General

Campus Activities:	Protest Theme: Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic-Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related-other Social Issues (N = 37) %
Continue as usual	68	80	89
Affected by protest	28	17	11
Can't determine	4	2	--

Table 10

Participants with Subject Role

Subjects	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic-Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related-other Social Issues (N = 37) %
Radical left (SDS)	28	20	78
Black students	92	17	11
Police	28	17	43
Antiprotesters (YAF)	--	5	11
Students in general	84	93	70
Administrators	96	85	70
Faculty	72	56	49
Trustees, alumni, parents	8	32	3
Off-campus participants	44	24	49

role in the three types of protests.

Radical left, generally SDS, were involved in over three-fourths of the war-related protests as well as a quarter of the racial protests and a fifth of the academic ones. Black students concentrated their efforts on racial concerns. Students in general (i.e., affiliation unknown) appeared in a large majority of protests, particularly those with racial or academic themes. The high administrative and faculty involvement in racial protests should be noted. Because academic and student life protests frequently centered on issues of governance, in a third of the cases trustees, alumni, or parents became involved.

The actual leadership of each protest was recorded on a separate page, and is shown in Table 11. Black students, as expected, led a great majority of the racial protests, but they shared the leadership in one-fourth of the protests with persons from off-campus. Black students were leaders in a few non-racial student life protests but never in war-related ones(which tended to be dominated by the radical left). In general, academic and student life protests were organized by unaffiliated students. "Students in general" also took leadership roles in 30 percent of the war-related disputes. The role of faculty protesters was perhaps somewhat greater than the table indicates. While individual faculty were actual leaders in between 8 and 11 percent of the protests, they encouraged others.

The Role of the Newspaper

It has been suggested that the campus newspaper may itself play an important role in protest either by nonobjective reporting or by inflammatory editorializing. Such bias was recorded in cases of clear evidence and is shown in Tables 12 and 13. (See page 26 for a description of criteria for judgment of bias.)

Table 11

Protest Leadership

Type of Leadership	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic - Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related- other Social Issues (N = 37) %
SDS	12	7	62
Other radical left	8	12	24
Black students	92	15	--
Students in general	8	88	30
Faculty	8	10	11
Off-campus	24	5	11

Table 12

Incitement to Protest by the Campus Newspaper

	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic - Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related - Other Social Issues (N = 37) %
Prior to Protest			
Urged Protest	--	7	8
Used Inflammatory Language	--	10	14
During Protest			
Urged Protest	4	29	19
Used Inflammatory Language	8	29	24

Table 13

Evaluation of the Objectivity
of the Campus Newspapers in Reporting Events

	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic - Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related - Other Social Issues (N = 37) %
Neutral	96	64	70
Slant pro-protest	--	37	30
Slant pro-administration	4	--	--

Student newspapers tended to be most biased pro-protest and most inflammatory in reporting academic and war-related issues. No evidence of a pro-protest slant was found in the reporting of events surrounding racial issues.

Events in Protest

Two types of events were coded: those which actually occurred and those which were announced (i.e., threats, plans, or offers). The events were classified in nine categories representing either protest behavior or response. The incidence of these nine types of events is presented by protest theme in Table 14. Occurrence of specific events is seen in Tables 15 and 17.

Protest Behavior

Most of the protests included some nondisruptive forms of dissent. Rallies, picketing, or marches were the most common incident, occurring 254 times in 68 separate protests. Presentation of demands occurred in nearly as many protests but fewer times per protest. While presentation of demands was more frequently associated with racial issues, rallies and marches were often organized to protest university policy on war-related and other social issues. Students tended to utilize petitions and to receive official student government support more in regard to academic issues.

Violence arose in 24 protests and disruption in 59. The least disruptive or violent protests centered on aspects of academic and student life. A high percentage of racial protests included some form of disruption, a favorite tactic being the sit-in. Sit-ins occurred in about one-fourth of all other protests. In the case of war-related protests, they often were staged in the recruiting office. Strikes or boycotts and interruptions of school functions occurred most often over racial or academic

Table 14

Incidence of Selected Types of Protest Events --
Percent of Protests with at Least One Event of Each Type

Events	All Protests (N = 103)		Protest Theme: Racial Policies (N = 25)		Academic and Student Life (N = 41)		War-related and Other Social Issues (N = 37)	
	Announced*	Occurred	Announced	Occurred	Announced	Occurred	Announced	Occurred
Violence	6	23	8	28	5	15	5	30
Disruption	22	57	20	84	20	49	27	49
Nondisruptive expression of dissent	36	92	16	100	34	88	51	92
Civil action	15	24	20	32	7	17	19	27
Institutional punitive action	19	36	16	36	15	29	27	43
Communications, attempts to resolve protest	26	82	40	100	24	85	19	65
Changes	6	49	16	80	2	59	3	16
Counteraction, support for administration	2	33	8	36	--	27	--	37
Negative or nonresponse	--	34	--	32	--	34	--	35

*Includes threats, plans, and offers.

Table 15

Incidence of Selected Protest Behaviors

Events	Number of Total Occurrences	Occurrences by Protest (Percentages) All Protests (N = 103)	Protests on Racial Policies (N = 25)	Protests on Academic & Student Life (N = 41)	Protests on War-related and Other Social Issues (N = 37)
VIOLENCE					
Fight	31	16	24	5	22
Property damage	22	9	8	5	14
Injuries	21	12	16	7	14
Burning, bomb	8	3	4	2	3
Destruction/files	2	2	--	5	--
DISRUPTION					
Sit-in	72	33	52	29	24
Strike/boycott	20	11	16	17	--
Interrupt school function	17	12	16	12	8
Interruption recruiting	14	8	4	2	16
Entrance barred	8	7	8	7	5
Officials captive	4	3	8	2	--
Intervisitation	2	2	--	5	--
Disrupt (other)	2	2	4	--	3
Property disruption no damage	1	1	4	--	--
NONDISRUPTIVE EXPRESSION OF DISSENT					
Rally/picket/march, etc.	254	66	60	51	86
Present demands	125	62	88	57	49
Petition	37	26	12	44	16
Student government issues pro-protest statement	28	23	20	42	5
Supportive statement	26	19	20	20	19
Boycott of facilities	3	1	4	--	--

issues. Violent events included both personal fights and injuries and property damage, as well as a few cases of burning or bombing.

Table 16 presents a breakdown of protests with violence, indicating the roles played by particular actors. SDS and white students in general were associated with violence more frequently than were blacks. Off-campus activists also played a role in violent protests. Most of the personal injuries were inflicted by police during melees or attempted arrests. Faculty played an activist role in one-third of the violent protests but managed to avoid all violent incidents.

Response to Protest

Some attempt was made in 84 percent of the protests to communicate with protest leaders (see Table 17). Usually a variety of approaches was employed including negotiations, formation of committees or groups to study demands, or explanations of the administrative position. Also polls or referendums to assess campus opinion were utilized in some academic and student life protests. In general, administrators were most responsive in racial protests. They tried almost every form of conciliation more often in these protests.

On the other hand, in over half of the war-related protests the administration did not even bother to discuss or negotiate the issues. Moreover, as Table 18 shows, large numbers of both protesters and administrators displayed unwillingness to compromise on war-related and other social issues. On these issues, the president was involved in only 38 percent of the cases as compared to 76 percent of racial protests and 63 percent of academic ones. Academic issues engaged the greatest involvement on the part of trustees (see Table 19).

Although administrators attempted conciliation more often in racial protests, they were as punitive in these cases as in war-related protests.

Table 16

Persons Involved in Protests with Violence

	SDS #	Black Students #	White Students (General) #	Off-Campus Activists #	Faculty #	Administration #	Police #	Off-Campus Antiprotesters (Union Members) #	Unknown #
Initiator of Violent Incident (or Involved but Initiator can't be Determined)									
Total # protests	11	6	15	6	--	3	9	2	X
Total # violent events	26	12	29	12	--	4	25	2	14
Burning, bombing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
Destruction of records, files	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Property damage	11	2	11	4	--	--	--	--	6
Injuries	1	2	2	--	--	2*	11*	--	2
Fight	14	8	16	8	--	2	14	2	2
Active Protester but not Known to be Involved in any Violent Event	3	1	2	4	9	--	--	--	--

*Objects of injuries inflicted by police and administrators were: white students (general) (5), SDS (4), administrator (1), not reported (4).

Table 17

Incidence of Selected Responses to Protest Behavior

Events	Number of Total Occurrences	Occurrences by Protest (Percentages) All Protests (N = 103)	Protests on Racial Policies (N = 25)	Protests on Academic & Student Life (N = 41)	Protests on War-related and Other Social Issues (N = 37)
CIVIL ACTION					
Arrests	37	11	8	7	16
Off-campus police	28	16	20	10	19
Civil action	13	6	12	2	5
Injunction obtained	11	7	16	2	5
National Guard	6	3	--	2	5
Indictments or convictions	6	6	--	7	8
Injunction served	5	3	4	2	3
INSTITUTIONAL PUNITIVE ACTION					
Campus security force	32	20	12	12	35
Suspension/probation	32	16	24	17	8
Case before judiciary body	31	17	28	12	14
Institution punitive of judicial action (unspecified)	19	4	4	7	--
Expulsion	3	3	8	2	--
Privilege withdrawn	3	3	12	--	--
Reprimands only	2	1	--	--	3
Recommend expulsion/probation/suspension	1	1	--	2	--
COMMUNICATIONS -- ATTEMPTS TO RESOLVE PROTEST					
Negotiate/discuss	147	63	88	68	41
Study, committee discussions	90	45	60	49	30
Administration explains position - clarifies	67	45	52	51	32
Recommendations for compromise/change	57	31	44	37	16
Poll, referendum	13	8	4	15	3
HEW compliance review	1	1	4	--	--

(Table 17 Continued on next page)

Table 17
Incidence of Selected Responses to Protest Behavior

Events	Number of Total Occurrences	Occurrences by Protest (Percentages) All Protests (N = 103)	Protests on Racial Policies (N = 25)	Protests on Academic & Student Life (N = 41)	Protests on War-related and Other Social Issues (N = 37)
CHANGES					
Changes on primary issue - partial	40	21	36	29	3
Changes on primary issue - complete	37	28	52	37	3
Punishment reduced - reversed	8	8	20	5	3
Changes - not related to issues	7	7	12	7	3
Temporary change, event called off	5	5	4	7	3
Changes on secondary issue - complete	4	3	--	2	5
Changes on secondary issue - partial	1	1	--	2	--
COUNTERACTION SUPPORT FOR ADMINISTRATION					
Statement pro-administration	23	19	16	17	24
Protesters decide to stop protest	7	7	8	7	5
Attempts at order	7	4	12	--	3
Rally, etc. vs. protest	5	4	4	--	8
Physical counteraction	5	5	--	5	8
Petition vs. protest	3	3	4	2	3
NEGATIVE OR NON-RESPONSE					
Decision vs. changes	40	28	20	29	32
Refusal to discuss	4	4	--	5	5
Deadline for changes passed	3	3	4	2	3
Employee fired	3	3	8	2	--

Table 18

Apparent Unwillingness to Compromise

Participant Group	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic - Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related- other Social Issues (N = 37) %
Protesters	16	10	54
Faculty	--	7	--
Administrators	12	17	43

Table 19

Participation in Negotiations

Persons Involved	Protest Theme		
	Racial Policies (N = 25) %	Academic - Student Life (N = 41) %	War-related - other Social Issues (N = 37) %
President	76	63	38
Other administrators	64	59	49
Faculty	60	54	35
Trustees	8	32	3

In racial protests, civil action involved off-campus police and injunctions (generally in relation to sit-ins). More arrests were made in war-related protests. Although campus security forces were employed more often against protesters on war-related issues, black students faced more campus judiciary bodies and were more frequently suspended. Overall, off-campus police arrived on the scene of 16 protests and campus police were on hand during one-fifth of them.

Changes

Tables 14 and 17 show that administrative response was most favorable in the case of racial protests. Complete changes on primary issues were forthcoming in half of these protests as opposed to 37 percent of academic protests and only 3 percent of the war-related ones. The specific issues associated with changes are presented in Table 20.

The administrative response to protest was clearly selective, and concessions were as limited as possible. Secondary issues, for example, elicited very few changes. In student life protests, more changes were forthcoming on facilities and parietal rules than on tuition or judiciary action. Student power protests elicited more changes on "general" involvement than on specific participatory roles, such as on the Board of Trustees. Facilities and improved working conditions for minority employees were the principle concessions to black students, although other scattered changes were promised. A glaring row of blanks shows up in the "changes" column with respect to war-related issues.

Many factors probably combine to explain the administrative responsiveness to racial protests compared to their nonresponsiveness to war-related ones. Aside from a prevailing attitude of "benevolence" towards minority groups, one should recall first that the black protests tended to be repeats of previous unrest and consequently were more bothersome. The protesters

Table 20

Changes on Primary and Secondary Issues

	Total Changes	Primary		Secondary	
		Change	No Change	Change	No Change
	#	#	#	#	#
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUES RELATING TO FACILITIES AND STUDENT LIFE	17	15	17	2	13
Specific issue:					
Judiciary process or punitive action	4	3	4	1	6
Facilities improved	5	4	2	1	5
Tuition and other fees	--	--	6	--	2
Parietal rules, intervisitation	4	4	2	--	--
Academic requirements, curriculum, grading	2	2	2	--	1
Police on campus	--	--	1	--	2
Working conditions (students)	2	2	--	--	--
Drug policy	1	1	--	--	--
Draft information	--	--	--	--	1
Scholarships (general)	--	--	--	--	1
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO STUDENT POWER IN DECISION-MAKING	14	10	19	4	8
Specific issue:					
Student voice in policy-making regarding student life, regulations, tuition	5	5	9	--	4
Student involvement in decision-making (general)	5	5	6	--	2
Student involvement in activities of trustees	1	--	4	1	--
Student involvement in long-range planning, advisory committee	3	2	1	1	--
Student involvement in selection and evaluation of faculty	3	3	1	--	--
Student-administration communications	2	--	--	2	1
Student involvement in administrative policy-making	--	--	2	--	--
Student involvement in curriculum planning	--	--	2	--	--
Student involvement in selection of speakers	--	--	1	--	1
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO RACIAL POLICIES	15	14	18	1	7
Specific issue:					
Facilities, activities for black students	5	5	6	--	3
More black staff	5	4	8	1	--
Official position on racism, racism (general)	--	--	8	--	4
Black studies, programs	3	3	7	--	1
More black students, special admissions	1	1	7	--	--
Conditions of minority employees	4	4	2	--	--
Minority employees, jobs	1	1	3	--	--
Black role in recruiting	2	2	--	--	--
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO THE INSTITUTION'S WAR (DEFENSE)-RELATED INVOLVEMENT	1	--	34	1	5
Specific issue:					
On-campus government-military recruiting	--	--	12	--	3
ROTC terminated	--	--	10	--	1
On-campus industrial recruiting	--	--	6	--	--
Official position or action regarding Vietnam, Moratorium	1	--	2	1	2
War-related research, machinery	--	--	3	--	--
ROTC altered	--	--	1	--	--
Police training	--	--	1	--	--
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO FACULTY (STAFF)	3	3	7	--	5
Specific issue:					
Versus staff member	2	2	3	--	4
Pro staff member	1	1	4	--	--
Pro staff cut-backs	--	--	--	--	1
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO THE INSTITUTION'S INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COMMUNITY, THE ENVIRONMENT	1	1	4	--	--
PROTESTS WITH ONE OR MORE ISSUE RELATING TO WORKER/EMPLOYEE RELATIONS	--	--	1	--	1

also listed many demands, so that concession to at least one was more likely. This interpretation is supported by the finding that, in spite of changes, as of March, fewer racial protests than academic ones were actually resolved. (See Table 21).

Amplifying Factors

Two measures of dimensions of protest are number of student protesters and number of events. A protest participation of over 1,000 students was reported for about one-fifth of the protests (see Table 22). This large participation was evident in 38 percent of violent protests, 34 percent of those with police, and 64 percent of those with arrests. Moreover, as Table 23 shows, student participation tended to increase following these events. Because violence and arrests often occurred together, it is not clear if one, some, or a combination of these three factors explains the increased student participation. Regression analyses reported in Volume II will deal with this problem by controlling for each of the variables.

Violence and civil action are also associated with lengthy protests, as shown in Table 24. Civil action (including arrival of police and arrests) is even more closely associated with lengthy protests than violence. Other high correlations are noted between long protests, counteraction, and institutional punitive action. Persons most highly associated with such protests are off-campus leaders, police, SDS, faculty, and anti-protesters.

Sequence of Protest Behaviors and Responses

In order to examine cause and effect relationships in protest, it is necessary to control for events which occur following the "effect." In other words, when violence and "police on campus" appear together frequently, one may only say that the two events are associated; but which is the "cart" and which the "horse"? Our research design, based on recording events in sequential order, enables us to examine associated variables in terms of

Table 21

Protests Apparently Resolved with Issues Settled

Protest Theme	%
Racial Policies (N = 25)	28
Academic and Student Life (N = 41)	39
War-related and other Social Issues (N = 37)	5

Table 22

Highest Reported Participation of Students as Protesters

Number of Student Protesters	Selected Protests			
	All Protests (N = 103) %	With Violence (N = 24) %	With Police (N = 29) %	With Arrests (N = 11) %
10 or less	10	--	7	9
11 - 25	8	4	10	--
26 - 50	14	4	10	--
51 - 100	9	21	17	9
101 - 250	17	17	14	18
251 - 500	9	13	3	--
501 - 1000	2	--	3	--
More than 1000	19	38	34	64
Not reported	14	4	--	--

Table 23

Size of Student Participation in Relation to the First Occurrence of Violence, Police on Campus, and Arrests

Highest Reported Participation	Violence (N = 24) %	Police Present (N = 29) %	Arrests (N = 11) %
Larger before	17	14	18
Same before and after	29	28	18
Larger during or after	38	38	45
None or not reported (either before or after)	17	21	18

Table 24

Variables Associated with Higher Number of Events

Variables	Phi Coefficients
Civil action	.657
Violence	.613
Off-campus leadership	.519
Counteraction	.516
Effect on campus activities in general	.515
Police (subject)	.509
Institutional punitive action	.502
SDS object	.488
Institutional punitive action announced	.485
Faculty object	.475
Negative or nonresponse	.451
Antiprotesters subject	.446
Faculty subject	.440
Threat of violence	.428
Civil action announced	.421
White students (general) object	.406
Administration subject	.356
Trustees object	.338
Disruption	.332
Communications	.326

*The significance level for continuous variables is .254 at the .01 level and .195 at the .05 level.

causal relationships. The results of multiple regression analyses, with controls for order of occurrence, will be presented in Volume II of this report. For Volume I, three tables have been drawn up to demonstrate the kinds of relationships between protest behaviors and responses which will be examined further.

In Table 25, ten events and responses are examined in relation to violence. This table indicates that, while both off-campus and campus police are highly associated with violence, campus police were present more often before the first act of violence occurred and off-campus police after the first violence. One may conjecture that the use of on-campus police is a catalyst for violence. Another factor which appears to have a causal effect on violence is the group of variables classified as "negative or nonresponse." That is, if the administration announces a definite negative decision on change, allows a deadline for meeting demands to pass without responding, or refuses to discuss the issues, the likelihood of violent protest increases.

Disruption on the other hand, cannot be explained on the basis of prior events (see Table 26). Because the two most highly associated events tended to occur after disruption, causality is not indicated. It appears from these first analyses, that participants rather than events will be predictors of disruption, since black student protest leadership is highly associated with this tactic.

Table 27 indicates two possible relationships between protest responses and changes. It appears that administrative use of civil action, including off-campus police, will emerge as a predictor of agreement on change. At the same time, if the administration attempts to communicate with protesters and negotiate on study demands, eventual change seems to be considerably more probable.

Table 25

Order of First Occurrence --
Violence and Other Events

Type of Event	First Occurred Before Violence	First Occurred After Violence	Phi Coefficients*
Nondisruptive dissent	21	3	.160
Disruption	13	7	.197
Counteraction or support for administration	7	9	.346
Off-campus police	6	10	.599
Civil action (other)	3	12	
Campus police	10	4	.449
Institutional discipline (other)	2	9	
Negative or nonresponse	12	4	.380
Negotiations/Communications	13	7	.025
Changes	2	8	-.030

*The significance level for continuous variables is .254 at the .01 level and .195 at the .05 level.

Table 26

Order of First Occurrence
Disruption and Other Events

Type of Event	First Occurred Before Disruption	First Occurred After Disruption	Phi Coefficients*
Nondisruptive dissent	36	16	-.177
Violence	7	13	.197
Counteraction or support for administration	5	18	.105
Off-campus police	4	11	.260
Civil action (other)	4	13	
Campus police	4	10	.238
Institutional discipline (other)	7	12	
Negotiations/Communications	25	29	.197
Negative or nonresponse	12	12	.081
Changes	3	26	.093

*The significance level for continuous variables is .254 at the .01 level and .195 at the .05 level.

Table 27

Order of First Occurrence --
Changes and Other Events

Type of Event	First Occurred Before Changes	First Occurred After Changes	Phi Coefficients*
Nondisruptive dissent	40	4	.137
Disruption	26	3	.093
Violence	8	2	-.030
Counteraction or support for administration	12	5	.062
Off-campus police	7	1	.325
Civil action (other)	5	3	
Campus police	4	3	-.039
Institutional discipline	8	2	
Communications	39	3	.312
Negative or nonresponse	13	4	.000

*The significance level for continuous variables is .254 at the .01 level and .195 at the .05 level.

Volume I - Summary

Part One

In Part One we have presented the results of a national survey of campus demonstrations that occurred during 1969-70. Because the data were obtained from an intensive analysis of student newspapers, the coverage has probably been more complete than in other surveys that have relied on questionnaires or secondary news sources.

We estimate that during 1969-70 there were more than 9,000 campus demonstrations involving about two-thirds of all higher educational institutions. Demonstrations not directed against the institution ("Earth Day" and the Moratorium observances, for example) were more frequent than were protests against institutional policies.

Property damage and physical violence occurred in proportionately few institutions (seven and three percent, respectively). About 12 percent of all institutions had one or more incidents that resulted in arrests of students.

Previous research on the institutional correlates of campus protest activity were confirmed, in that nearly all types of protests during 1969-1970 were most likely to occur in the larger and the more selective institutions.

Part Two

In Part Two we have presented descriptive findings of a study of 103 protests (all directed against the institution). The same newspaper file was utilized as a data source. An examination of process in campus unrest has been enabled by recording all events in a single protest, as well as participants in each event, in sequential order. The coding scheme provides for 64 different events including tactics and responses. Interrelationships have been examined between issues, participants, protest behavior, protest

response, and additional variables such as precipitating and amplifying factors.

Racial protests resulted more than others from non-resolution of previous protests and dissatisfaction with facilities and services. In these protests, black students tended to present lists of a series of equal priority demands. War-related protests, which focused on fewer issues, were often precipitated by the arrival on campus of an industrial or governmental representative. Academic and student life protests were almost all new causes, often in reaction to a specific administrative action or decision.

Racial protests made the greatest overall impact on the campus and war-related ones the least.

As expected, black students led most racial protests, radical left students led most war-related protests, and unaffiliated students led most of those on issues of academic and student life. Off-campus leaders appeared most frequently in racial protests.

The student newspapers tended to be most biased pro-protest and most inflammatory in reporting academic and student life or war-related and other social issue protests.

The least violent and disruptive protests centered on aspects of academic and student life. A high percentage of racial protests included some form of disruption, a favorite tactic being the sit-in. Black students were, however, less frequently involved in violent incidents than were other student groups. Most of the personal injuries were inflicted by police during melees or attempted arrests. Faculty played an activist role in one-third of the violent protests but managed to avoid all violent incidents.

Administrators were most responsive (in negotiations and eventual changes) in black protests and least so in war-related ones. They were also

relatively punitive with respect to black students.

In general, concessions were limited, and few changes on secondary issues were reported.

Violence and civil action (particularly arrests) appear to be amplifying factors in protest, as they are associated with large student participation, increases in student participation, and a high number of events.

Protest behaviors and responses were examined according to their sequential relationship to violence, disruption, and change. While both off-campus and on-campus police are associated with violence, campus police presence tends to precede violence (indicating a possible causal relationship) but off-campus police presence tends to follow the first violent act. Administrative negative or nonresponse also precedes and is highly associated with violence.

Disruption appears to be associated more with persons than with events. This analysis also suggests that if the administration responds to protest by initiating either civil action or negotiations, the probability of eventual change is increased.

References

Astin, A. W. The College Environment. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Astin, A. W. "How Colleges Are Rated," Change Magazine, November/December, 1970, pp. 1; 85-86.

Astin, A. W. "Campus Disruption, 1968-69: An Analysis of Causal Factors," Psychology and the Problems of Society (Eds. Frances F. Korten, Stuart W. Cook, and John I. Lacey). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1970, pp. 377-87.

Astin, H. S. Themes and Events of Campus Unrest in Twenty-two Colleges and Universities. BSSR Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1969.

Astin, A. W., Bayer, A. E. "Antecedents and Consequents of Disruptive Campus Protests," Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, in press.

Astin, A. W., Panos, R. F., & Creager, J. A. "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen -- Fall 1966," ACE Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Bayer, A. E., & Astin, A. W. "Violence and Disruption on the U. S. Campus, 1968-1969," Educational Record, Fall, 1969.

Hodgkinson, H. L. "Institutions in Transition," A Report to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970.

Peterson, R. E. "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-68," unpublished manuscript. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Staff of the Office of Research. "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen -- Fall 1970," ACE Research Reports, Vol. 5, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

APPENDIX I

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D C 20036

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

As part of our Cooperative Institutional Research Program, we have been examining newspapers of about 200 institutions of higher education for reports of protest incidents. At present, we are engaged in the detailed analysis of over 100 protests relating to institutional policy.

One aspect of this study involves coding the events of each protest in order of occurrance (September, 1969 - February, 1970), so that we may learn more about the sequence of certain protest events and responses. Although these chronologies were compiled from newspapers which may in some cases be biased in favor of the protesters, we are hoping that the actual reporting of events was accurate enough to present a fair picture of the order in which the major events occurred.

I am enclosing a Xeroxed copy of the coded chronology of some selected protest events at your school and would greatly appreciate your looking over the written description for any important errors in sequence. If you wish to make note of any changes, just jot them down in the margin or on a separate piece of paper. Please return the Xeroxed page with or without changes as soon as you possibly can within the next month, as we hope to begin processing the data on May 20, 1970.

For your convenience, we are enclosing a return envelope.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Ann S. Bisconti,
Research Analyst

ASB/jtr
Enclosures